REMARKS

In response to the Office Action mailed November 24, 2000, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner enter the above amendments and consider the following remarks. A marked-up version of the changes is attached hereto. Claims 14-20 have been canceled without prejudice, and new claims 21-27 have been added. As a result, claims 1-13 and 21-27 are still pending in the application. The Applicant respectfully requests further examination and reconsideration of the application in light of the amendments and accompanying remarks.

Rejection of Claims 14-20 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner rejected claims 14-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Malucelli et al. The Examiner also rejected claims 14-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Malucelli et al. The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. Nevertheless, the Applicant has canceled claims 14-20 without prejudice and added new claims 21-27 to more clearly describe the present invention. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully submits the rejection is moot.

Malucelli et al. does not teach or suggest new claims 21-27. Malucelli et al. requires a pelletizing step prior to making a product. Moreover, Malucelli et al. does not teach or suggest extruding a composition to make a product. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully submits that Malucelli et al. cannot support a rejection of claims 21-27 under 35 U.S.C. §102 or 35 U.S.C. §103.

Rejection of Claims 14-20 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner rejected claims 14-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Motegi et al. The Examiner also rejected claims 14-20 under 35 U.S.C. §

103(a) as being obvious over Motegi et al. The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. Nevertheless, the Applicant has canceled claims 14-20 without prejudice and added new claims 21-27 to more clearly describe the present invention. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully submits the rejection is moot.

Motegi et al. does not teach or suggest new claims 21-27. Motegi et al. requires the step of heat-treating the cellulosic filler with glyoxal. Motegi et al. also requires a pelletizing step prior to making a product. Moreover, Motegi et al. does not teach or suggest the amount of lubricants or inorganic filler in the composition. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully submits that Motegi et al. cannot support a rejection of claims 21-27 under 35 U.S.C. §102 or 35 U.S.C. §103.

Rejection of Claims 14-20 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner rejected claims 14-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Bistak et al. The Examiner also rejected claims 14-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Bistak et al. The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. Nevertheless, the Applicant has canceled claims 14-20 without prejudice and added new claims 21-27 to more clearly describe the present invention. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully submits the rejection is moot.

Bistak et al. does not teach or suggest new claims 21-27. Bistak et al. requires the use of rubber particles in the composition. In addition, the examples of Bistak et al. do not teach or suggest the use of wax in the amount of the present invention. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully submits that Bistak et al. cannot support a rejection of claims 21-27 under 35 U.S.C. §102 or 35 U.S.C. §103.

Rejection of Claims 14-20 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner rejected claims 14-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Stead et al. The Examiner also rejected claims 14-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Stead et al. The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. Nevertheless, the Applicant has canceled claims 14-20 without prejudice and added new claims 21-27 to more clearly describe the present invention. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully submits the rejection is moot.

Stead et al. does not teach or suggest new claims 21-27. Stead et al. uses a polypropylene material that includes a significant percentage of α-olefin. Moreover, Stead et al. does not teach or suggest the use of inorganic filler in the amount of the present invention. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully submits that Stead et al. cannot support a rejection of claims 21-27 under 35 U.S.C. §102 or 35 U.S.C. §103.

Rejection of Claims 1-20 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner rejected claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Woodhams. The Examiner also rejected claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Woodhams. The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Woodhams does not teach or suggest the present invention. With regard to claims 1-13, it appears to the Applicant that Woodhams does not teach or suggest the use of process aids. Furthermore, Woodhams does not teach or suggest the combination (including the various ranges) of ingredients in the PVC material of the present invention. On the other hand, claims 14-20 have been canceled without

prejudice. Consequently, the rejection of claims 14-20 is moot. Nevertheless, it should be noted that Woodhams fails to teach or suggest a method which employs the amount of lubricant in the polypropylene material of new claims 21-27. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully submits that Woodhams cannot support the rejection of claims 1-13 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) or 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Rejection of Claims 1-20 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner rejected claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Brandt. The Examiner also rejected claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Brandt. The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Brandt does not teach or suggest the present invention. With regard to claims 1-13, the ranges of the cellulosic filler and the PVC material disclosed by Brandt are outside of the ranges of the present invention. On the other hand, claims 14-20 have been canceled without prejudice. Consequently, the rejection of claims 14-20 is moot. Nevertheless, it should be noted that Brandt does not provide any particular polypropylene compositions. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully submits that Brandt cannot support the rejection of claims 1-13 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) or 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Rejection of Claims 1-13 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner rejected claims 1-13 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Fujita et al. The Examiner also rejected claims 1-13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Fujita et al. The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Fujita et al. does not teach or suggest the present invention. In particular, Fujita et al. fails to teach or suggest the ranges of the ingredients in the PVC material of the present invention. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully submits that Fujita et al. cannot support the rejection of claims 1-13 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) or 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

CONCLUSION

The Applicant has distinguished claims 1-13 and 21-27 over the cited references. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully submits that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and such action is earnestly requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 5/24/01

Jeffrey S. Standley
Registration No. 34,021
Standley & Gilcrest LLP
495 Metro Place South
Suite 210
Dublin, Ohio 43017-5319
Telephone: (614) 792-5555
Fax: (614) 792-5536

VERSION WITH MARKINGS TO SHOW CHANGES MADE

IN THE CLAIMS

Claims 14-20 have been canceled without prejudice.

New claims 21-27 have been added:

21. (new) A method of manufacturing a cellulosic/polymer product, said method consisting essentially of:

mixing together a composite consisting essentially of:

(a) at least one cellulosic filler in an amount of about 30% to about 70% by weight of said composite; and

(c) at least one polypropylene material in an amount of about 30% to about 70% by weight of said composite, said at least one polypropylene material comprised of at least one lubricant in an amount of about 10 to about 20 parts per 100 parts of a polypropylene resin;

transferring said composite to an extruder independent of a pelletizing step; and

extruding said composite through a die to form a final shape.

22. (new) The method of claim 21 wherein said at least one cellulosic filler is in an amount of about 40% to about 50% by weight of said composite.

23. (new) The method of 21 wherein said at least one cellulosic filler is wood flour.

24. (new) The method of claim 21 wherein said at least one polypropylene material is in an amount of about 50% to about 60% by weight of said composite.

25. (new) The method of claim 21 wherein said at least one lubricant is in an amount of about 14 to about 19 parts per 100 parts of said polypropylene resin.

26. (new) The method of claim 21 wherein said at least one polypropylene material is further comprised of at least one inorganic filler in an amount up to about 70 parts per 100 parts of said polypropylene resin.

27. (new) The method of claim 26 wherein said at least one inorganic filler is in an amount of about 20 to about 60 parts per 100 parts of said polypropylene resin.